

REMARKS

The applicant submitted one amendment and an alternative amendment on 2 July 2008 in response to final office action shown in Paper No. 20080415.

In the one amendment, the applicant amended 1-17 and changed the languages in claims 1 and 10. The applicant acknowledged that the Examiner denied the entry of this amendment as stated in Paper No. 20080715.

In the alternative amendment, the applicant amended claims 2 through 9 in order to overcome the Examiner's 112 rejection by amending the preamble "apparatus" to "digital settop box" in claims 2 through 9. Therefore, in the alternative amendment, the applicant amended the preamble of claims 2 through 9 in order to follow the Examiner's suggestion of correction. No new issue was raised in the alternative amendment.

In the advisory action (Paper No. 20080715), the Examiner asserted that the amendments to claims 1 through 17 changed the scope of the claimed invention. Therefore, the Examiner merely considered the applicant's amendment where claims 1 through 17 were amended, and did not consider the applicant's alternative amendment where only claims 2 through 9 were amended in order to follow the Examiner's suggestion of correction.

Therefore, the advisory action (Paper No. 20080715) is deemed incomplete and thus the Examiner respectfully requested to consider the applicant's alternative amendment filed on 2 July 2008.

If there are any questions, the examiner is asked to contact the applicant's attorney.

No fee is incurred by this Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert E. Bushnell

Attorney for the Applicant

Registration No.: 27,774

1522 "K" Street N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 408-9040
Folio: P56914
Date: 7/23/08
I.D.: REB/XL